

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This amendment responds to the Office Action dated March 31, 2009.

The Examiner indicated that claim 87 is allowable and that claims 21 and 69 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

The Examiner rejected each of claims 1-7, 9-20, 22-34, 36, 37, 39-47, 49-56, 58-68, and 70-86 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Yeo et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,219,837 (hereinafter Yeo) in view of Tovinkere et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,678,635 (hereinafter Tovinkere), and in further view of Moran et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,717,879 (hereinafter Moran) and Ahmad et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,880,171 (hereinafter Ahmad).

Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite two additional limitations that distinguish over the cited prior art. First, claim 1 recites the limitation of “said bounded spatial region having a respective size based on the number of sequential frames included in the respective segment represented by said bounded spatial region.” The Examiner notes that the primary reference Yeo represents segments by individually-selected key frames shown on a display, and that these key frames have a bounded rectangular area. *See* Office Action dated March 31, 2010 at p. 3 (“The bounded region that is defined indicates video data as frames.”). The foregoing limitation precludes the reading of the claimed “bounded spatial region” on a displayed key frame as taught by Yeo.

Second, independent claim 1 has been amended to recite the limitation of “displaying in an interactive display said temporal location for a first semantic characterization of an event in said audio using a first visual indication and displaying said temporal location for a second semantic characterization of an event in said audio using a second visual indication different from said first visual indication, where said first and second semantic characterizations are each individually distinguishable when their associated visual indications graphically overlap.” This limitation is not disclosed by the cited prior art, and in fact the applicant notes that none of the cited references even disclose the threshold limitation of graphically overlapping the various visual indications of semantic content let alone doing so in a manner that individually distinguishes them in that instance.

For each of these reasons, independent claim 1, as well as its dependent claims 2-7, 9-20, and 22-28 patentably distinguish over the cited prior art.


Each of independent claims 29 and 56 have been amended to recite the limitation of “where said first and second semantic characterizations are each individually distinguishable when their associated visual indications graphically overlap.” Therefore these claims, as well as their respective dependent claims 30-34, 36, 37, 39-47, 49-55, 58-68, and 70-86 each patentably distinguish over the cited prior art.

In view of the foregoing remarks, the applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-7, 9-34, 36, 37, 39-47, 49-56, and 58-86.

Respectfully submitted

April 28 2010

Dated



Kurt Rohlf
Reg. No, 54,405
Tel:(503)2227-5631